



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/753,817	01/08/2004	Rhonda L. Childress	AUS920030939US1	6768

35525 7590 07/29/2009  
IBM CORP (YA)  
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC  
P.O. BOX 802333  
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
----------

ANWARI, MACEEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2444

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/29/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/753,817  
Filing Date: January 08, 2004  
Appellant(s): CHILDRESS ET AL.

---

Wayne P. Bailey  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 4/08/2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 11/14/2008.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

<b>2004/0221296</b>	<b>Ogielski et al.</b>	<b>11-2004</b>
<b>2002/0194324</b>	<b>Guha</b>	<b>12-2002</b>

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 22- 24** recite the limitation "the plurality of servers". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

**Claims 18- 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims fail to place the invention squarely within one statutory class of invention. On paragraph 67 of the instant specification, applicant has provided evidence that applicant intends the "medium" to include signals. As such, the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim(s) is/are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1- 4, 7, 8, 10- 14 and 21- 24** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ogielski et al.** (herein after **Ogielski**) U.S. Publication No.: 2004/0221296 A1 and further in view of **Guha** U.S. publication No.: 2002/0194324 A1.

Regarding **claim 1**, **Guha** discloses method in a data processing system for monitoring transactions for a set of known nodes in a network data processing system, the method comprising:

receiving cache data from a router in the data processing system, wherein the cache data includes an identification of the set of known nodes sending data packets for transactions onto the network data processing system (**Par. 14; collecting routing messages/data and obtaining routing patterns**);

identifying the transactions handled by each node in the set of known nodes using the identification of the set of nodes included in the cache data received from the router, to form identified transactions (**Par. 14; monitoring network traffic, collecting routing messages/data**);

analyzing the identified transactions (**Par. 14; analyzing data**); and in response to the analyzing the identified transactions, selectively initiating a load balancing process for at least one of the nodes in the set of known nodes to mitigate transaction overload at the

Art Unit: 2444

at least one of the nodes (**Figures 6, 9 and par. 18; dynamically balanced loads of storage centers**).

However, **Ogielski** remains silent on the specific teachings of in response to the analyzing the identified transactions, selectively initiating a load balancing process for at least one of the nodes in the set of known nodes to mitigate transaction overload at the at least one of the nodes.

In the same field of endeavor, **Guha** discloses the specific teachings of in response to the analyzing the identified transactions, selectively initiating a load balancing process for at least one of the nodes in the set of known nodes to mitigate transaction overload at the at least one of the nodes (**Figures 6, 9 and par. 18; dynamically balanced loads of storage centers**).

Accordingly it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the networking art to modify or incorporate **Guha's** teachings of load balancing with the teachings of **Ogielski** to provide for a more efficient and robust system.

Regarding **claim 2**, **Ogielski-Guha** further discloses wherein the cache data is from an address resolution protocol cache located on the router (**Par. 14; collecting routing messages/data and obtaining routing patterns**).

Regarding **claim 3**, **Ogielski-Guha** further discloses wherein receiving cache data from other routers on the network data processing system (**Par. 14; collecting routing messages/data and obtaining routing patterns**).

Regarding **claim 4**, **Ogielski-Guha** further discloses wherein the receiving step occurs on a periodic basis (**par. 11; SNMP monitoring**).

Regarding **claim 7, Ogielski-Guha** further discloses wherein generating a display of the set of known nodes in a graphical view, wherein the graphical view includes the communications paths with a graphical indication of the network traffic **(Figures 3 and par. 28 & 52-57; global routing report on user interfaces)**.

Regarding **claim 8, Ogielski-Guha** further discloses wherein the cache data is received through an agent located on the router **(Abstract and Par. 14; collecting routing data from a plurality of network routers)**.

Regarding **claim 21, Ogielski-Guha** further discloses wherein the agent clears the address resolution protocol cache each time the cache data is sent to the data processing system **(Abstract and par. 14; network data streamed in real time, and current router data compared to previous router data)**.

Regarding **claim 22, Ogielski-Guha** further discloses wherein the router receives a request from a client data processing system, where the request is then received by a network dispatcher that is interconnected to the router and a plurality of server data processing systems, where the plurality of servers appear to the client as a single server having a single network address **(Guha- Figures 6, 7, 9 and Abstract and par. 8- 9; clustered servers and requested content)**.

**Claims 10-14, 17-20 and 23-24** list substantially the same elements as those stated within **claims 1-4, 7-8 and 21-22** and are therefore rejected with the same rationale and motivation as applied to **claims 1-4, 7-8 and 21-22**.

**Examiner Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other**

Art Unit: 2444

**passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.**

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

In substance the appellant argues: 1) that the rejection of **claims 22-24** under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph is in error; 2) that **claims 18- 20** comply with USPTO's guidelines regarding proper statutory subject matter; 3) that **claim 1** has been erroneously rejected and a proper prima facie showing of obviousness has not been established; 4) that **Ogielski** does not teach the receiving of cache data from a router and that the received data includes node identification information; 5) another issue regarding deficient prima facie obviousness showing that while **Guha** describes load balancing, such load balancing is performed on I/O loads at storage centers and not on nodes that are identified using cache data received from a router; 6) that **Ogielski-Guha** does not teach/suggest any type of address resolution protocol cache located on the router; 7) since **Ogielski's** figure 3 is not a proper reference in rejecting **claim 7** as its effective date does not predate the filing date of the present application; 8) that there is no teaching/suggestion that cache data is received through an agent located on the router; 9) that **Ogielski** does not teach or suggest the clearing of the ARP cache each time the cache data is sent to the data processing system; 10) **Ogielski-Guha** do not teach/suggest a network dispatcher that is interconnected to a router and a plurality of server data processing systems, or that a plurality of servers appear to a client on a single server having a single network address; 11 & 12) that the examiner has provided no reasoning why the rejection of such a claim is obvious.



In response to appellant's argument 1), the examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim states "the plurality of servers" without any previous mention of a plurality of servers within the instant claim or within the parent claim; therefore the examiner maintains that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

In response to 2), the examiner respectfully disagrees. Within the appellant's specification the examiner finds evidence (i.e., par. 67) where the medium used can take the form of signals and transmission media; both of which are non-statutory subject matter (for further clarification refer to rejection above).

In response to 3), the examiner respectfully disagrees. **Ogielski** focuses on methods and systems to monitoring network routing, and more particularly to monitoring, collecting, analyzing and presenting to users network data from a plurality of network routers. Furthermore, **Ogielski** discusses the concerns relating to increased routing traffic; whereas **Guha** is concerned with end-to-end content delivery and management with quality of service enforcers that monitor and control traffic. Therefore, the examiner asserts that **Ogielski's** concerns of an monitoring and analyzing increasing network infrastructure/traffic provide motivation for **Guha's** load balancing in order to meet acceptable service level agreements.

In response to 4), the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above **Ogielski** discloses a methods and systems to monitoring network routing, and more particularly to monitoring, collecting, analyzing and presenting to users network data from a plurality of network routers. Therefore, the examiner asserts that cache data is simply a form of stored data and all routers have stored within them routing tables (i.e.,

Art Unit: 2444

routing data) that identifies other nodes connected to the routers. Furthermore, **Ogielski** disclose the global routing infrastructure as characterized by the Internet and/or the World Wide Web (WWW) which uses the protocols TCP/IP for communicating data between nodes; and as such the IP packet headers used have within them information identifying source and destination nodes. If this wasn't the case this would pose some serious enablement concerns.

In response to 5), the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner asserts that as stated in response to argument 4), that cache data is simply stored data and furthermore asserts that since **Guha** discloses that load balancing (as appellant admits) is performed on I/O loads at storage centers then it still reads on this limitation. Because the claims states "load balancing process for at least one of the nodes in the set of known nodes" and a known node is simply read as, one that is identifiable/reachable by the other network components. **Ogielski-Guha** disclose just such a feature through IP headers and addresses and through the use of the BGP which designate network reachability.

In response to 6), the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner asserts that address resolution protocol (ARP) is an internet standard used to find a host's hardware address when and IP or some other network layer address is known. As stated earlier **Ogielski** discloses the global routing infrastructure as characterized by the Internet and/or the World Wide Web (WWW) which uses the protocols TCP/IP for communicating data between nodes (e.g., using the Border Gateway Protocol). ARP would have to be utilized within the routers otherwise this would pose serious

Art Unit: 2444

enablement concerns (e.g., the components would not be able to communicate/transmitted data among each other).

In response to 7), the examiner respectfully disagrees. There are various sections of **Ogielski**, that read on the limitation of **claim 7** (i.e., par. 52-57) and as such there is support found for generating a display (i.e. in the form of a report) within the provisional application which predates the present application.

In response to 8), the examiner respectfully disagrees. The term agent is very broad and as such is read as thing that acts or has the power to act and since **Ogielski** teaches the collecting of routing data from a plurality of routers than the very component doing the collecting (i.e., the agent) reads on the limitation.

In response to 9), the examiner respectfully disagrees. Routers have daemons to perform timeouts in order to remove/clear entries within their routing tables as the network infrastructure/topologies are updated.

In response to 10), the examiner respectfully disagrees. Firstly the examiner would like to point out that this claim is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph; secondly the examiner will like to assert that **Guha** discloses the existence of clustered servers which can act as one server.

In response to 11 & 12), the examiner has included a state above stating that **claims 23-24** are rejected using the same reasoning/rationale and motivation applied to **claims 1-4, 7-8 and 21-22**.

Art Unit: 2444

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

M.A. 7/18/2009

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444

Conferees:

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444

/Hassan Phillips/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2451